Page 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

W. A. DREW EDMONDSON, in his)
capacity as ATTORNEY GENERAL)
OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA and)
OKLAHOMA SECRETARY OF THE)
ENVIRONMENT C. MILES TOLBERT,)
in his capacity as the)
TRUSTEE FOR NATURAL RESOURCES)
FOR THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA,)

Plaintiff,)

VS.) 4:05-CV-00329-TCK-SAJ

TYSON FOODS, INC., et al,)
Defendants.)

VOLUME I OF THE VIDEOTAPED

DEPOSITION OF SCOTT WELLS, PhD, produced as a witness on behalf of the Defendants in the above styled and numbered cause, taken on the 22nd day of January, 2009, in the City of Tulsa, County of Tulsa, State of Oklahoma, before me, Kristen Holmes, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, duly certified under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Oklahoma.

TULSA FREELANCE REPORTERS 918-587-2878

SCOTT WELLS, PhD, VOLUME I, 1-22-09

| | | Page 4 |
|----|--|---------|
| 1 | (Whereupon, the deposition began at | |
| 2 | 9:03 a.m.) | |
| 3 | THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now on the record | |
| 4 | for the deposition of Dr. Scott Wells. Today is | |
| 5 | January 22nd, 2009. The time is 9:00 a.m. Would | 09:03AM |
| 6 | counsel please identify themselves for the record? | |
| 7 | MR. PAGE: David Page representing the | |
| 8 | State of Oklahoma. | |
| 9 | MR. BASSETT: Woody Bassett representing | |
| 10 | the George's defendants. | 09:03AM |
| 11 | MS. LONGWELL: Nicole Longwell on behalf of | |
| 12 | Peterson Farms. | |
| 13 | MS. HILL: Theresa Hill on behalf of the | |
| 14 | Cargill defendants. | |
| 15 | MR. ELROD: John Elrod on behalf of | 09:04AM |
| 16 | Simmons. | |
| 17 | MR. GEORGE: Robert George on behalf of the | |
| 18 | Tyson defendants. | |
| 19 | THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you. The witness | |
| 20 | may be sworn in. | 09:04AM |
| 21 | SCOTT WELLS, PhD | |
| 22 | having first been duly sworn to testify the truth, | |
| 23 | the whole truth and nothing but the truth, testified | |
| 24 | as follows: | |
| 25 | DIRECT EXAMINATION | |

TULSA FREELANCE REPORTERS 918-587-2878

SCOTT WELLS, PhD, VOLUME I, 1-22-09

| | | | Page 111 | |
|----|----------------------------|--|----------|--|
| 1 | had be | en someone else that had been tasked to do it, | | |
| 2 | but du | e to a conflict of interest, they couldn't use | | |
| 3 | them. | | | |
| 4 | Q | Okay. Do you know who that someone else was? | | |
| 5 | А | At that time I did not. | 11:52AM | |
| 6 | Q | Do you know now? | | |
| 7 | A | I think I know. Well, I think it was Tetra | | |
| 8 | Tech. | Just and this is just my recollection of | | |
| 9 | readin | g Gene Welch's deposition because I think that | | |
| 10 | was br | ought up. | 11:52AM | |
| 11 | Q | And anyone in particular at Tetra Tech that | | |
| 12 | was tasked? | | | |
| 13 | А | I do not know. | | |
| 14 | Q | Okay. What was the nature of the conflict, if | | |
| 15 | as | you understood it? | 11:52AM | |
| 16 | A | I actually have no idea. | | |
| 17 | Q | Okay, all right. Had Tetra Tech performed any | | |
| 18 | modeli | ng work prior to June or July of 2007 with | | |
| 19 | respect to Lake Tenkiller? | | | |
| 20 | A | I do not know. | 11:53AM | |
| 21 | Q | Okay. Were you you weren't provided with | | |
| 22 | any work by Tetra Tech? | | | |
| 23 | А | Not from Tetra Tech. | | |
| 24 | Q | Were you provided by in any lake I'm | | |
| 25 | sorry. | Strike that. Were you provided with any | 11:53AM | |

SCOTT WELLS, PhD, VOLUME I, 1-22-09

| | | Page 112 |
|----|--|----------|
| 1 | lake modeling work by any other expert? | |
| 2 | A Yes. | |
| 3 | Q Who? | |
| 4 | A The State of Oklahoma gave me a CD with | |
| 5 | information on the EFDC model that was put together, | 11:53AM |
| 6 | I assume, from Dynamic Solutions, Paul Craig, who I | |
| 7 | know. | |
| 8 | Q Is Paul Craig a competent modeler? | |
| -9 | A Yeah. | |
| 10 | Q Was there a problem in your professional | 11:53AM |
| 11 | judgment with either the setup design or results of | |
| 12 | the EFDC model? | |
| 13 | A The EFDC model uses a basis of field data from | |
| 14 | 1992 and '93. So the dataset was old, and some of | |
| 15 | the phosphorus information going back to '92 and '93 | 11:54AM |
| 16 | was deemed unreliable due to the sampling method | |
| 17 | that was used. Also, the information that was | |
| 18 | provided to me was not sufficient to judge whether | |
| 19 | the model had been adequately calibrated or set up, | |
| 20 | and, also, if we were going to do long-term | 11:54AM |
| 21 | simulations, the 3-D model run would've taken an | |
| 22 | even more inordinate amount of time to run than what | |
| 23 | we had with the W2 model. | |
| 24 | Q Has David Page been the primary attorney with | |
| 25 | whom you have worked in this case? | 11:54AM |